Message

From: Kraft, Andrew [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=4A94A4F199B247778ABB02285A51B927-KRAFT, ANDREW]
Sent: 2/13/2018 4:43:41 PM
To: Sasso, Alan [Sasso.Alan@epa.gov]
CC: Thayer, Kris [thayer.kris@epa.gov]; Berner, Ted [Berner.Ted@epa.gov]; Cai, Christine [Cai.Christine@epa.gov]; Blessinger, Todd [blessinger.todd@epa.gov]; Hogan, Karen [Hogan.Karen@epa.gov]; Radke-Farabaugh, Elizabeth [radke-farabaugh.elizabeth@epa.gov]; Gibbons, Catherine [Gibbons.Catherine@epa.gov]; Glenn, Barbara [Glenn.Barbara@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: selecting studies for dose-response-- Cr6 example

Here is the complementary table in formaldehyde (note: only medium or high confidence studies testing multiple doses are included herein; the data for neuro were considered insufficient- explained separately):

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

From: Kraft, Andrew
Sent: Tuesday, February 13, 2018 11:34 AM
To: Sasso, Alan <Sasso.Alan@epa.gov>
Cc: Thayer, Kris <thayer.kris@epa.gov>; Berner, Ted <Berner.Ted@epa.gov>; Cai, Christine <Cai.Christine@epa.gov>; Blessinger, Todd <blessinger.todd@epa.gov>; Hogan, Karen <Hogan.Karen@epa.gov>; Radke-Farabaugh, Elizabeth <radke-farabaugh.elizabeth@epa.gov>; Gibbons, Catherine <Gibbons.Catherine@epa.gov>; Glenn, Barbara <Glenn.Barbara@epa.gov>; Kraft, Andrew <Kraft.Andrew@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: selecting studies for dose-response-- Cr6 example

Hey Alan,

Thanks for looping me in. I wasn't on the chloroform call, so I'm not sure if the scope of what I was envisioning was exaggerated, but please see if the below response answers your questions.

First, I like a lot of what you have proposed. What I mentioned we need to develop for the Handbook/ protocol was a template version of the table you included to document which studies are advanced further for dose-response evaluation, and the specific rationale. We have a very complementary table in formaldehyde that I was taking my "vision" from. There are, however, a couple of aspects I think we need to be sure are incorporated into the template version that I think your table misses:

-

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Separately, Karen has been working on the Handbook and protocol text to better clarify the rationale for decisions (i.e., criteria or considerations) for prioritizing certain studies over others for derivation of chronic/lifetime values. I think that your text and flow chart is largely consistent with those considerations. However, I personally think that some of these materials- other than the table and rationale for advancing/ not advancing studies further, are probably better in an Appendix, and only the primary factors considered at this point are needed in the text.

Eventually, we will also need to develop text and approaches or considerations other than these general factors for use in selecting single values from amongst or across the studies that meet these more general criteria (i.e., selection from amongst the candidate values). I realize this will be very difficult to do a priori, but we will want to include at least some typical things to consider at this later stage as well.

Hope this helps,
Andrew

P.S.: I am not sure what the process is for moving this forward, but I think it would obviously be most appropriate if the SWG were to spearhead the effort, and reach out to others in the SRWG (via Karen?) to ensure a clear tie-in with the evidence synthesis and integration approaches. I cc'd some SRWG leaders.

From: Sasso, Alan
Sent: Tuesday, February 13, 2018 9:30 AM
To: Kraft, Andrew <Kraft.Andrew@epa.gov>
Cc: Thayer, Kris <thayer.kris@epa.gov>; Berner, Ted <Berner.Ted@epa.gov>; Cai, Christine <Cai.Christine@epa.gov>; Blessinger, Todd <blessinger.todd@epa.gov>; Hogan, Karen <Hogan.Karen@epa.gov>
Subject: selecting studies for dose-response-- Cr6 example

Hi Andrew,

At our chloroform meeting yesterday, I heard that you might be working on adapting the handbook text to systematically determine studies suitable for dose-response.

Karen had a quick example in the NTP slides (but I can't remember those and need to re-look).

Attached is what I had developed for Cr(VI), and SWG reviewers liked it--- but it's very customized to Cr(VI). If everyone can take a look and let me know what you think. (Something like this could also be applied to chloroform or other chemicals). If the systematic review WG is going in a different direction with the methods, please let me know so I can change Cr(VI) accordingly.

-Alan